REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. The final office action mailed October 17, 2003 rejected claims 1-33. Applicant has added new claim 34. No new matter has been included by the newly presented claim and it is respectfully submitted that each of the present claims find basis and support in the application as filed. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record.

Rejection of Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3-10, 17, 19-21, 24, 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. patent No. 6,484,149 to Jammes et al (hereinafter "Jammes"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Jammes does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites, among other things, a method for extracting data from a network by (a) creating a database-structured query; (b) determining a web domain address on the network from which to extract the data, **the web domain address having content**; and (c) extracting data from the determined web domain address based on the database-structured query.

As described in the specification, the disclosed invention employs a database-structured query language to treat a network as a searchable database. Page 8, Lines 25-26; page 3, lines 2-3. That is, content at the web domain address may be searched using the structured-database query. This is very different from Jammes. Jammes merely teaches examining the URL itself to locate a template file, which in turn includes a query script. The query script may then be executed upon a database. Fig. 18, Col. 46, lines 15-32. Jammes does not disclose or suggest the web domain address **as having the content** to be searched. Jammes does not treat the content located at the web

domain address **as if it were a searchable database.** Instead it merely searches a database using the query script that was identified by the URL. It is very different to treat a web domain address as having the content itself that is searched, and using a URL to direct a query to a database from which content may be located. This difference is significant, as Jammes simply does not disclose or teach this limitation. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Jammes does not render the claimed invention obvious.

Additionally, independent claims 11, 17 each recite, among other things, that **at least a portion of the data is located at the web domain address.** Moreover, independent claim 27 clearly recites that **the website is processed as a searchable database**. Clearly, Jammes does not disclose or teach that the **website itself** is processed **as a database**. Jammes merely uses a query script to search an existing database. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, Jammes does not render independent claims 11, 17, and 27 obvious.

As to dependent Claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Jammes does not disclose or suggest "following links contained within web domain...." Jammes merely creates links that are employed to display a result. See Jammes Col. 45, lines 55-67, and Col. 46, lines 56-57. Thus, for at least this reason, Jammes does not render dependent claim 4 obvious.

Moreover, in regard to Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-26, and 28-33 which are dependent on independent Claims 1, 11 and 17, and 27, respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

New Claim 34 recites, among other things, "determining at least one webpage upon which to perform a search," "parsing the at least one webpage in search of data...wherein the at least one webpage is processed as though it is a searchable database," and "extracting at least a

portion of the data." New claim 34 makes clear without adding new matter that the claimed invention searches websites (webpages), rather than merely using a URL to locate a database from which to a search may be performed. As such, it is clear that Jammes neither discloses nor suggests the claimed invention of Claim 34. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claim 34 should be allowed over the cited art of reference.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicant believes that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Early favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is urged. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: December 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jamie Wiegand
Registration No.: 52,361
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8915
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

CUSTOMER NO.: 07278